



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,689	02/09/2006	Hiroyuki Kikkoji	278537US6PCT	2371
22850 7590 07/16/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER VU, PHU ANH TRAN				
ART UNIT 2437		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 07/16/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

DETAILED OFFICE ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 06/03/2009.
2. Claims 1-9 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 06/03/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 3-4, Applicant argues that Kuriya fails to disclose "deleting means for deleting the apparatus ID data ..., when the receiving means receives request data ... including the user ID data and the apparatus ID data."

In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in Fig. 17, Kuriya describes a check-in process, in which the manager server receives the check-in request from the mobile telephone (step S4204 and step S4206). In [320], Kuriya discloses such a check-in request includes user ID and content ID. Since the user ID and the content ID collectively imply the apparatus ID, the apparatus ID is therefore implicitly included in the check-in request. In other words, the user ID and the content ID constitute another image of the apparatus ID, using this information, the implicitly included apparatus ID is deleted by the deleting means as described in [0324]. The fact that the manager server of Kuriya knows which apparatus ID is to be deleted in responsive to the check-in request described above clearly shows the check-in request

must carry information regarding identification of the apparatus. The "information regarding identification of the apparatus" is the "apparatus ID data" recited because it is the data that identify the apparatus.

Therefore, in contrast with Applicant's arguments, Kuriya clearly discloses the feature of "deleting means for deleting the apparatus ID data ..., when the receiving means receives request data ... including the user ID data and the apparatus ID data."

On page 4, Applicant argues that "Applicants respectfully submit that the explanation provided in the Official Action is deficient inasmuch as it fails to explain why one of ordinary skill in the art would modify the single deletion performed by the Kuriya management server to delete additional data. It is therefore submitted that the Office has engaged in impermissible hindsight in contravention of MPEP § 2145 X A. "

In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Deleting unnecessary data or data that is no longer needed is always desirable at least for the reasons of storage and management efficiency. In this case, when a content is checked out by the apparatus, the apparatus ID and the content ID are associated with each other to keep records of clients and corresponding provided services. Conversely, when the content is checked in and the apparatus ID is deleted, the content ID associated with the apparatus ID that identifies the checked-in content is no longer needed in the record of the client. Thus, it should also be deleted at least to make efficient use of storage space. In addition, since Kuriya discloses deleting the apparatus ID as the last step of the check-in process as described in the previous Office Action (in reference to Kuriya, step S4206 of Fig. 17),

Art Unit: 2437

Examiner respectfully submits that there is no impermissible hindsight engaged in establishing the obviousness rejections as set forth in the previous Office Action.

Applicant's arguments described on page 5 are moot for the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHY ANH VU whose telephone number is (571)270-7317. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thr 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/PHY ANH VU/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437